<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 21, 2006. Claims 1 to 7, 27 to 29, 32 to 35, 38 and 41 are pending in the application, with Claims 8 to 15 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 27, 33 and 41 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was objected to for an informality. Without conceding the correctness of this objection, Claim 15 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,205 (Gacek). Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 12, 27 to 29, 32 to 35, 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gacek in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,782 (Montague). Claims 6 and 14 were rejected under § 103(a) over Gacek and Montague in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,921 (Kadowaki), and Claim 13 was rejected under § 103(a) over Gacek and Montague in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,677 (Weigley). Without conceding the correctness of any of the foregoing rejections, the rejections as to Claims 8 to 15 are believed to be obviated by the cancellation of these claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections as to the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

<u>Independent Claims 1 and 7</u>

The invention of Claims 1 and 7 generally concerns authentication in a print process executed by a printer driver in a client apparatus. The printer driver in the client apparatus obtains information identifying an application which issued an instruction to print electronic data using an application interface (API) called by the printer driver. The

- 10 -

printer driver also executes an authentication request for approving an output process of the electronic data based on the information identifying the application. Additionally, the printer driver is used to control a print process so as to permit generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a success of the authentication, or to stop generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a failure of the authentication.

By virtue of this arrangement, in which the functions described above are performed by a printer driver in a single apparatus (i.e., client apparatus), print resources may ordinarily be managed more effectively.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to an authentication method in a print process that requires authentication, wherein the print process is executed by a printer driver in a client apparatus. The method includes obtaining, from electronic data for which an instruction to print has been issued, information identifying an application which issued the instruction to print the electronic data, wherein the information is obtained by using an application interface (API) for the printer driver. The method also includes executing an authentication request for approving an output process of the electronic data based on the information identifying the application. The method further includes controlling the print process so as to permit execution of a generation of print data, using the printer driver, from the electronic data and from the output process, in response to a success of the authentication, and controlling the print process so as to stop execution of the generation of print data, using the printer driver, from the electronic data, in response to a failure of the authentication.

Independent Claim 7 is directed to a system substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 1 and 7, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest a client apparatus including a printer driver which obtains information from electronic data identifying an application which issued an instruction to print the electronic data using an application interface (API), which executes an authentication request for approving an output request of the electronic data based on the information, and which controls a print process so as to permit or stop generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a success or failure of the authentication.

As understood by Applicant, Gacek discloses authorized transmission of print data from an internet application to a home access device. The home access device is connected to a printer serviced by a remote print server which controls data transmission to the home access device. Authorization to transmit print data from the internet application to the home access device (via the remote print server) is obtained from an appropriate intermediary service, and the authorized print data is transmitted from the remote print server to the home access device for printing on the printer. See Gacek, Abstract and Column 18, lines 8 to 12.

More specifically, as understood by Applicant, in Gacek a print job authorized by an intermediary service is transmitted to a Cable Head End (CHE), which controls transmission of the data to the respective Set Top Box (STB) of one or more users. See, e.g., Column 11, line 66 to Column 12, line 60.

However, none of the entities in Gacek's system are seen to disclose a client apparatus including a printer driver which performs the functions of the printer driver of Claims 1 and 7.

In this regard, Figure 2 of Gacek shows a printer driver 28 located in Set Top Box (STB) 10. However, printer driver 28 is not seen to perform the functions of the printer driver of Claims 1 and 7. In particular, printer driver 28 is only provided in set-top box 10 "in order to rasterize an internally-generated print job within set-top box [STB] 10 for printing on printer 12." Gacek, Column 8, lines 14 to 17. In fact, this rasterizing is the only action that printer driver 28 is seen to perform. See generally, Gacek.

Printer driver 28 is therefore not seen to obtain information identifying an application which issued an instruction to print using an application interface (API), to request authentication, or to permit or stop execution of print data in response to a success or failure of authentication.

Thus, STB 10 can not possibly correspond to the client apparatus of Claims 1 and 7, since printer driver 28 of STB 10 does not perform any of the features of the printer driver of a client apparatus in Claims 1 and 7.

Gacek's Cable Head End (CHE) is also not seen to correspond to the client apparatus of Claims 1 and 7, and in particular is not seen to feature the claimed printer driver of the client apparatus.

In this regard, Gacek's CHE 6 may optionally include a printer driver in a preferences directory 21. See Gacek, Column 8, lines 17 to 21 and Column 15, lines 5 to 13. However, much like printer driver 28 in Gacek's STB 10, the CHE's printer driver is

- 13 -

also seen only to be used to be used for rasterizing internally-generated print jobs. See Gacek, Column 8, lines 17 to 21 and Column 15, lines 5 to 13.

Thus, since the printer driver of the CHE also lacks the features of a printer driver of the client apparatus of Claims 1 and 7, the CHE also can not correspond to the client apparatus of Claims 1 and 7.

Alternatively, Gacek's third-party internet applications could be considered "client", since these entities issue a request for a print process. However, Gacek's third-party internet applications are not even seen to include a printer driver.

Thus, Gacek is not seen to disclose or to suggest a client apparatus including a printer driver which obtains information from electronic data identifying an application which issued an instruction to print the electronic data using an application interface (API), which executes an authentication request for approving an output request of the electronic data based on the information, and which controls a print process so as to permit or stop generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a success or failure of the authentication.

Montague, Kadowaki and Weigley have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the shortcomings of Gacek.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 27, 33 and 41

The invention of Claims 27, 33 and 41 generally concerns a print process which is executed by a printer driver in an information processing apparatus. The printer

- 14 -

driver in the information processing apparatus extracts information identifying an application which issued an instruction to print electronic data from the electronic data, using an application interface (API). The printer driver also outputs the extracted information to an external processing apparatus in order to obtain authentication for the print process based on the information. In addition, the printer driver is used to control a print process so as to permit generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a success of the authentication or to stop generation of print data from the electronic data in response to a failure of the authentication.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 27 is directed to an information processing apparatus communicating with an external processing apparatus performing an authentication for a print process executed by a printer driver in the information processing apparatus. The apparatus includes extracting means for extracting, from electronic data for which an instruction to print has been issued, information identifying an application which issued the instruction to print the electronic data, output means for outputting the information extracted by the extracting means to the external processing apparatus in order to obtain the authentication for the print process based on the information, and control means for controlling the print process so as to permit execution of a generation of print data, using the printer driver, from the electronic data and the output process, in response to a success of the authentication, and to stop execution of the generation of print data, using the printer driver, from the electronic data, in response to a failure of the authentication. The extracting means extracts the information identifying the application from the electronic data for which an instruction to

- 15 -

print has been issued by calling the printer driver and an application interface (API) provided in the printer driver, wherein the API exchanges data between the printer driver and an operating system that operates the electronic data in the information processing apparatus.

Independent Claims 33 and 41 are directed to a method and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 27.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 27, 33, and 41, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of an information processing apparatus including a printer driver which extracts information identifying an application which issued an instruction to print electronic data by calling an application interface (API), which outputs the extracted information to the external processing apparatus in order to obtain the authentication for a print process, and which controls a print process to permit or stop execution of generation of print data in response to a success or failure of authentication.

In particular, as discussed in detail above, the applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest a single client apparatus including a printer driver which obtains information identifying an application which issued an instruction to print using an application interface (API), which executes an authentication request, and which controls a print process to permit or stop execution of print data in response to a success or failure of authentication.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art is also not seen to disclose or suggest the above-noted features.

Therefore, independent Claims 27, 33 and 41 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Guzniczak
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 59,820

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 128005v1

- 17 -